REMARKS

The Office Action mailed November 18, 2005, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 12-14 stand rejected and claims 4-11 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 15-20 have been added herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

Please note that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed herein on January 24, 2005, and that no copy of the PTO-1449 was returned with the outstanding Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests that the information cited on the PTO-1449 be made of record herein. A second copy of the January 24, 2005, Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 with copy of cited references, and USPTO date-stamped postcard were filed on June 9, 2005. It is respectfully requested that an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 evidencing consideration of the cited references be returned to the undersigned attorney.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,817,535 to Akram

Claims 1 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Akram, U.S. Patent No. 5,817,535 (hereinafter "Akram"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Akram discloses a method of fabricating a Single In-line Memory Module (SIMM) in a Leads-Over-Chip (LOC) arrangement that includes a plurality of slots in a substrate and a plurality of semiconductor dice mounted thereon. Col. 1, lines 9-14. A circuit board 12 includes a plurality of slots 20 that extend through the circuit board 12. Col. 4, lines 59-65; FIG. 1.

Akram, however, does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, a method for forming an interposer substrate that includes forming a first elongated interconnect slot and at least a second elongated interconnect slot with a longitudinal axis of the first interconnect slot and the at least a second interconnect slot positioned approximately collinear to a longitudinal centerline of the substrate, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Because Akram does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, every element as set forth in amended independent claim 1, the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

The withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 14 is respectfully requested as it depends directly from allowable independent claim 1, among other reasons.

Claim 14 is additionally allowable because Akram does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, a method that includes locating the at least one transversely extending crosspiece substantially at a longitudinal midpoint of a combined length of the first elongated interconnect slot and the at least a second elongated interconnect slot, among others.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,817,535 to Akram

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

> M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:
>
> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (Emphasis added).

The nonobviousness of amended independent claim 1 precludes a rejection of claims 12 and 13 which depends either directly or indirectly therefrom because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. *See* In re Fine, 5

U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *see also* MPEP § 2143.03. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejection to claims 12 and 13 which depend from allowable independent claim1.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,817,535 to Akram in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,597,643 to Weber

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram in view of Weber, U.S. Patent No. 5,597,643 (hereinafter "Weber"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The nonobviousness of independent claim 1 precludes a rejection of claim 2 which depends directly therefrom because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. *See* In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *see also* MPEP § 2143.03. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejection to claim 2 that depends directly from allowable independent claim 1.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,817,535 to Akram in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,635,124 to Parsons

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akram as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Parsons, U.S. Patent No. 3,635,124 (hereinafter "Parsons"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

The nonobviousness of independent claim 1 precludes a rejection of claim 3 which depends indirectly therefrom because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. *See* In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *see also* MPEP § 2143.03. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejection to claim 3 that depends indirectly from allowable independent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Craig Buschmann
Registration No. 57,829
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: February 21, 2006
CB/djp:eg
Document in ProLaw